

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 24 are currently pending in the application.

This amendment is in response to the Final Rejection in the Office Action of June 1, 2005.

**Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicants note the filing of a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement herein on May 23, 2005 and note that a copy of the PTO/SB/08A was not returned with the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that the information cited on the PTO/SB/08A be made of record herein.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections**

Anticipation Rejection Based on Sakaki et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0017652)

Claims 1 through 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0017652).

Applicants assert that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

*Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants assert that the Sakaki et al. reference does not anticipate the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 because the Sakaki et al. reference does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claimed inventions in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Applicants assert that the Sakaki et al. reference does not identically describe the elements of the inventions calling for "a stress-balancing layer covering at least a portion of the

back side substantially balancing the stress caused by the passivation layer covering a portion of the integrated circuit, the stress-balancing layer comprising at least one of a metal, a metal alloy, a metallorganic material, a photoresist material, a multifilm layer material, a tape material, an adhesive material, a chemical vapor deposition material, and a physical vapor deposition material”, “a stress-balancing layer covering at least a portion of the back side, the stress-balancing layer for balancing a portion of the front side stress with a generally equivalent back side stress, the stress-balancing layer comprising at least one of a metal, a metal alloy, a metallorganic material, a photoresist material, a multifilm layer material, a tape material, an adhesive material, a chemical vapor deposition material, and a physical vapor deposition material”, “a stress-balancing layer covering at least a portion of the back side substantially balancing the stress caused by the passivation layer covering a portion of the integrated circuit, the stress-balancing layer comprising at least one of a metal, a metal alloy, a metallorganic material, a photoresist material, a multifilm layer material, a tape material, an adhesive material, a chemical vapor deposition material, and a physical vapor deposition material”, and “a force-balancing layer covering at least a portion of the back side, the force-balancing layer for balancing a portion of the force on the front side, the stress-balancing layer comprising at least one of a metal, a metal alloy, a metallorganic material, a photoresist material, a multifilm layer material, a tape material, an adhesive material, a chemical vapor deposition material, and a physical vapor deposition material”. Applicants assert that the Sakaki et al. reference merely describes the use of a resin film 2 bonded to a back surface 1Y facing the circuit formation surface 1X of the semiconductor chip 1 so as to cover the back surface 1 Y. Applicants assert that such is not the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1 , 7, 13, and 19.

Therefore, presently amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are allowable as well as dependent claims 2 through 6, 8 through 12, 14 through 18, and 20 through 24 therefrom.

Applicants request entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The amendment is timely filed.

The amendment does not require any further search or consideration.

The amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

Applicants submit that claims 1 through 24 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.  
Applicants request the allowance of claims 1 through 24 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: August 1, 2005

JRD/djp:lmh

Document in ProLaw